



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/592,914

09/10/2008

Xiu-Min Li

2005577-0010

6272

24280 7590 08/25/2009  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP  
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, SUSAN COE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/25/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@choate.com



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed July 30, 2009 has been received and entered. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 2, 4, 12, 13 and 15 have been cancelled in this amendment.
3. Claims 1, 3, 5-11 and 14 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampson (WO 01/66122) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action.

All of applicant's arguments regarding this ground of rejection have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the reference does not provide any guidance to indicate that the specifically claimed composition would be effective to treat or lessen the severity of food allergy or anaphylactic shock. Applicant also argues that the reference does not specifically teach that each of the claimed ingredients is useful for treating allergies. However, page 6 of the reference specifically states that an herbal composition containing one or more of Ganoderma lucidum (Ling Zhi), Fructus Pruni Mume (Wu Mei), Pericarpium Zanthoxyli Bungeani (Chuan Jiao), Rhizoma Coptidis (Huang Lian), Cortex Phellodendri (Huang Bai), Rhizoma Zingiberis Officinalis (Gan Jiang), Ramulus Cinnamomi Cassiae (Gui Zhi), Radix Ginseng (Ren Shen), and Radix Angelicae Sinensis (Dang Gui) is useful in treating allergies. Since page 6 teaches that one or more of these ingredients is useful in treating allergies, the reference clearly teaches that each individual ingredient is useful in treating allergies. Thus, it would be obvious for an artisan to select any combination of these

Art Unit: 1655

ingredients because such a combination is specifically within what is taught in the reference. As discussed in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (KSR), 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007):

A person of ordinary skill in the art is also a person of ordinary creativity, and not an automaton...When there is a design need of market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

Combining ingredients known to be useful for the same purpose is considered to be an obvious modification of the prior art. The artisan would predict that the composition composed of the individual ingredients would be useful for the same purpose as the individual ingredients. Thus, selection of specific ingredients from the reference is not considered to be inventive.

In addition, applicant argues that the current specification shows that each of the individual components reduce anaphylaxis to the degree shown by the combination of the claimed ingredients, i.e. the FAHF-2 product. The applicant points out Example 8, Table 4 to support this assertion. Applicant also has supplied Kattan (Phytotherapy Research (2008), vol. 22, pp. 651-659) to show that the FAHF-2 functions more effectively than a combination of *Phellodendron chinense* (Huang Bai), *Ganoderma lucidum* (Ling Zhi) and *Zingiber officinalis* (Gan Jiang). However, this evidence of unexpected results is not considered to render the claimed invention patentable over the prior art because the unexpected results are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention (see MPEP 716.02(d)). Table 1 in applicant's specification describes the ingredients in FAHF-2. This table shows that FAHF-2 contains specific amounts of each ingredient. Kattan also teaches that FAHF-2 is made with specific amounts (see Table 1). Applicant's current claims are not limited to a particular amount of each

Art Unit: 1655

ingredient. Thus, applicant's showing of unexpected results is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. Therefore, the claims are not considered to be allowable based on unexpected results.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampson as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 above, and further in view of prior art admitted by applicant in the specification for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action.

Applicant argues that the prior art admitted in the specification does not cure the deficiencies of Sampson. However, Sampson is not considered to be deficient for the reasons discussed above.

6. No claims are allowed.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe Hoffman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Coe Hoffman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655